

# The Converted Catholic

BISHOP MANUEL FERRANDO, D.D., Editor and Publisher

"When thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren."—Luke 22: 32.

---

Vol. XXX

DECEMBER, 1913

No. 12

---

## EDITORIAL NOTES

*"God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth."*

I wish to call the attention of my readers to a few more instances illustrating the Roman doctrine of "intention" which have come within my personal experience.

One of my greatest disillusionments came to me shortly after my ordination to the priesthood. Among my associates in the monastic life there was a certain "father" who enjoyed the greatest fame of sanctity. Even miracles were attributed to him. His manner, his piety—everything—seemed to surround him with an aureole of holiness. There could be no greater honor for me than to assist him at mass. I truly believed him a second Saint Francis.

But after my ordination he came to confess to me, and I cannot express my horror and amazement as he poured forth the story of a vile life. I could not believe my ears at first. Then I thought it must be the devil that had taken his form in order to destroy my veneration for himself; therefore I exorcised him, but he did not disappear as a cloud of smoke! It occurred to me that he was insane; but this theory I was obliged to abandon also, as the things he related were self-evident. Were I to tell what I heard, however, I should hardly be believed. There was no crime of immorality described in the Moral Theologies of which he was not guilty. And the way he perpetrated these crimes was the most extraordinary piece of subtle hypocrisy imaginable. He was always careful to choose as victims only such ignorant country people as he could dupe. I confessed

some of them, and they had no suspicion that they had been vilely deceived. The idea had been instilled into their minds that a holy monk could do no wrong, so they were as wax in his hands, and yielded implicit obedience to every wish however base. This seems incredible; but to such an extent has Rome enslaved the hearts and minds of her ignorant devotees that it is a fact. He kept up the illusion of great sanctity by going down to the church and kneeling before the sacrament for hours together. The poor people would count themselves happy to be able to surround him there and kiss his hands. One of the fathers assured me that he saw him in ecstasy two feet above the ground!

We were in the confessional over three hours, and I finally decided I could not give him absolution. Instead, I asked his permission to consult with some older and more-experienced father, without naming him, but he refused. So I put him off till next day in order to consult some authors on the subject. To my surprise he went directly from the confessional to say mass. I could do nothing to prevent him, as that would be to violate the secrecy of the confessional. But that evening I called him again to the confessional and expressed my horror at seeing him say mass after being denied absolution.

At first he argued that he was under suspended sentence, and therefore did no wrong in saying mass. But I showed him his foolishness, as the suspended sentence was not on account of any doubt concerning the hideousness of his sins, but on account of doubt as to my authority to absolve him. He then said that not to say mass would be a great scandal, more damaging to the Church than his secret sins, and that anyway, *he did not consecrate*; that is, he did not perform the required act of "intention" when he pronounced the words of consecration. Upon questioning him I found out that he had not made a good confession in many years, and that, in spite of what the Church teaches to the contrary he thought that it was worse for him to consecrate, being in mortal sin, than not to do so, therefore he never had any intention. I tried my best to persuade him, thinking that he must feel some compunction or repentance when he had been prompted to come to me and make a complete confession, but it was in vain; he was not penitent, nor had he any purpose of amending his life. The real reason for his seeking me was

because he saw one of his young and innocent victims come to confess to me, and fearing that in order to be able to denounce him, I should persuade this person to repeat whatever incriminated him outside the confessional, he at once forestalled such action on my part by confessing fully to me himself, thus binding me to keep his secret. Such are the defenses Rome devises behind which crime may flourish unchecked. My hands were tied, and I could do nothing but deny him absolution, and tell him to go and confess to another father. Whether he amended his life or not I do not know. He never came to me again. He said mass and listened to confessions every day. I have also seen him go to confess to another father, but he would not be two minutes in the confessional, which made me believe that he preferred keeping his good reputation to making a true confession. If he has since died I am sure he will be canonized, such was his fame as a saint. Yet, as we have seen, he was in reality a monster of immorality, and all his devotees who imagined they perceived the very odors of Heaven about him when he was saying mass were, according to the Church's own teachings, actually committing the sin of idolatry by worshiping an unconsecrated wafer.

To every true and devout Catholic, as well as every earnest Christian, of whatever denomination, I present these facts as food for reflection. Where is the *spirituality*, where is the pure and beautiful *truth* of a life of faith and worship as transparent as crystal, taught and lived by the Saviour of mankind?

As we draw near the blessed season of the year when all Christendom commemorates His birth we more than ever long to make known His own pure teachings to those from whom they have been hidden by a thousand masks and distortions.

**The New Year.**—On the threshold of the new year we turn to look back upon the old, and while we extend every good wish to our friends, and pray they may be given every spiritual blessing in the coming year, we at the same time would assure them of our gratitude for their moral support and material assistance in the past.

We desire to thank our Board of Trustees for their unselfish and untiring assistance, advice and confidence, and we also

wish to give a public testimony of gratitude to our faithful secretary, Prof. W. R. Collins, D.D., for his tireless labor of love and his zeal in the interests of the great cause.

Christ's Mission has been prospered and blessed, and to God, our Father, we would render thanks and praise.

Have there been difficulties? Yes, many. Difficulties which have come through those who ought to be our friends, as well as from those we naturally expect to be our foes. But, by the grace of God, every difficulty has been, or will be, surmounted.

**Our Plans.**—We are in the Lord's service for His pleasure. The future is in His hands, and we would follow only His guidance.

Many plans for making the work of Christ's Mission more effective are under prayerful consideration, and we wish to impress it upon the minds and hearts of our friends that under God's blessing all depends upon a whole-hearted co-operation on their part. Let us all unite and present a solid front against everything in itself opposed to the truth of God which makes men free, and let us liberate our country from the subtle web of deceit which is being so artfully woven about it.

---

## A CATHOLIC'S CONFESSION

This poem is sent to us by our dear old friend, the Rev. Dr. King. We are glad to publish it, hoping that it may touch some soul.

I need no other plea  
With which to approach God  
Than His own mercy, boundless, free,  
Through Christ on man bestowed;  
A Father's love, a Father's care,  
Receives and answers every prayer.

I need no human ear  
In which to pour my prayer;  
My great High Priest is ever near,  
On Him I cast my care;  
To Him, Him only, I confess,  
Who can alone absolve and bless.

I need no other works by me,  
Wrought with laborious care,  
To form a meritorious plea  
Why I Heaven's bliss should share  
Christ's finished work, through boundless grace,  
Has there secured my dwelling-place.

I need no prayers to saints,  
Beads, relics, martyrs' shrines;  
Hardships 'neath which the spirit faints,  
Yet still sore burdened pines.  
Christ's service yields my soul delight,  
Easy His yoke, His burden light.

I need no other book  
To guide my steps to Heaven  
Than that on which I daily look,  
By God's own Spirit given,  
And this when He illumines our eyes,  
"Unto salvation makes us wise."

I need no holy oil  
To anoint my lips in death;  
No priestly power my guilt to assail,  
And aid my parting breath;  
Long since these words bade fear to cease:  
"Thy faith hath saved thee, now go in peace."

I need no priestly mass,  
No purgatorial fires,  
My soul to anneal, my guilt to efface,  
When this brief life expires;  
Christ died my eternal life to win;  
His love has cleansed me from all sin.

I need no other dress,  
I urge no other claim  
Than His unspotted righteousness,  
In Him complete I am.  
Heaven's portals at Thy word fly wide,  
No passport do I need beside.

## THE YOKE OF ROME

*"The truth shall make you free."*—St. John 8: 32.

A few years ago a very intelligent young priest said to me: "I should like to know something of the teachings of the Protestant Church; much that is taught by Rome seems to me puerile. A great deal of it I do not believe. As a priest, I am unhappy, because I am bound by irrevocable vows, which, I realize now, too late, were made in the first fervor of a young seminarian's enthusiasm.

"I realize now that no man is fit to take so grave a step at the early age of twenty-three, never having seen the world, his character undeveloped. Yet, I did this very thing.

"The way it came about was this: My mother dedicated me to the priesthood. I was, therefore, educated to that end. I accepted all that was said and taught without rebelling, though in my heart of hearts I wished it had been otherwise. No one but a Catholic can understand that to cancel a mother's vow is next in seriousness to breaking one's own. This I could not do. I sometimes faltered, but would put the thought away from me as the blackest temptation. Like Samuel, I had been dedicated to the service of God, and I determined I would be true to the cause. This, then, is where I stood during the months of my probation; albeit, not so, the night of my reception.

"I had been imbued with the idea that the priesthood was something noble—something truly worth striving for—the most beautiful, the highest life which any man could attain on this earth. Once in it, I believed we would be upheld and strengthened by the Christian fellowship and example of our brethren. I became, therefore, fervently desirous of making my vows when the day arrived.

"It has all proved a chimerical dream. In point of fact, the life of a priest is one calculated to bring out the very worst in a man—I speak of the assistant priest in a large city. He receives the adulation of the people; he has little to do, plenty of money in perquisites, with the races and drink at his elbow. If he be not inclined to these vices he has the choice of living a life destitute of companionship and interest. I have wondered

how some intellectual men could take to these things, and then I have thought, a man is a sociable being; he will oftentimes talk to his dog if he has no one human to speak to. This accounts, in part, for the sad cases I see that never reach the ears of the laity. One after another, as the ideals were shattered, I have said: 'This is the human side; what has it to do with the true Church of God?'

"I have been a priest seven years; I am now a man with all a man's propensities, with all a man's strength—physical and intellectual—as, indeed, he had). I am full of action, strong for the good cause; of a religious turn. I am not misplaced as a minister of the Gospel. I wish to help others; I want to see abuses righted; I want to *work*. Instead, I am, perforce, *inert*. I have my hours of duty, it is true, principally to say mass, hear confessions once a week, to be at the house certain days, should any one call. The caller is generally some one with an overscrupulous conscience about some ridiculous trifle, or one who comes to give a dollar for a mass; the rest of the time I am idle.

"There are four of us in the house; we are well fed and keep four in help. I have had time to think, and think deeply. It is true, 'He also serves who only stands and waits.' But of late I have been beset by doubts. There are things I cannot believe, but which I am willing to accept—if, as the Church holds—acceptance is all that is necessary.

"The Church teaches we must bend our finite minds to the teachings of the Holy Ghost, who enlightens the Holy Father and our more intelligent superiors. The Bible says," and he pointed out the chapter and verse (St. Matt. 18: 17), 'If he neglect to hear the Church let him be unto thee as a heathen and a publican.' In a word, then, 'He who heareth the Church, heareth me.' Who would fly in the face of this? Yet, in spite of every argument I make to settle my doubts, the question forces itself back on me: 'Who is the Church?' And the second passage flashes before my eyes: 'Unto thee will I give the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven.' And so, when I say: 'I wish I knew more of what Protestants teach, on what they ground their religion, it is a passing thought—it could do no good. I am a Catholic by birth and education; I dare not question; it would lead to my certain

destruction. For if I were not a Catholic I would be an infidel. I am an extremist, and to turn back now would be my undoing. I know the system is faulty; it is through this so much evil exists. The dogmas seem to me wrong. The casuistry is sometimes remarkable, permitting almost any scope for a man to lie or for the torture of a scrupulous conscience.

"Oral confession was certainly not the primitive way in early ages. A little girl one day said to me: 'Father, I went to a dance last night, and I kicked high.' She took my breath at first, and then the absurdity struck me, and I answered: 'You can kick as much as you please; you are not a priest.'

"This sort of thing is surely all wrong; it is unscriptural; it cannot be in keeping with early tradition. Sometimes for hours we hear the most puerile confessions from the ignorant—mostly women. It reminds me of a story once told by an old priest, who had spent half the day in the confessional listening to overscrupulous penitents. On this occasion a servant girl went to him and said: 'Father, I use powdher!' 'What?' 'I use powdher.' 'You use what?' 'I use powdher.' And in a fit of impatience he exclaimed: 'Well, bad 'cess to you; may it blow you up!' This is a feeble example of how our patience and minds are tried over puerile confessions for hours at a time to no purpose." What a waste of human energy! "I am confronted by these things," he continued; "and, worst of all, I cannot express them to one who understands me. If I speak to a priest I am met by the answer: 'Through pride Lucifer fell; sacrifice your intellect to your superiors. The burden of responsibility is not on your shoulders.'"

It happened he was talking to one who did understand him, in part; but being in the same boat I could not advise. Before I became a Catholic the president of one of the Jesuit colleges said to me: "You have naturally an analytical mind—a good thing sometimes under due restraint. Ours is the only religion, and once a member of it you will understand all those things which you cannot grasp now—only a Catholic can understand them." *Truly indeed!*

All convent training can be summed up in this: "He who heareth the Church heareth Me." What Church? "Why, fool-

ish girl," the nuns would answer: "There is but one Church—the Holy Roman Catholic, headed by St. Peter, who is infallible, because Christ invested him with the keys to the sacred treasury of knowledge. The Holy Ghost tells him; he tells us. Could anything be more direct? And, oh, how simple!"

Yes, after all these years I can freely answer: "Yes, Rev. Mother, one thing could be more direct, but nothing more simple and idiotic." I did not see it then.

Christ said: "Search the Scriptures." But Christ is not the visible Head of the Church, and in *His absence* the word of the spiritual head on earth has greater weight. This visible leader says: "I am the interpreter, the all-inspired. You must hearken to my word, or be regarded as a heathen and a publican—the most degraded and discarded of all the human race! If you do not listen to me, but search the Scripture for yourself, you are anathematized! You will go, not to purgatory, but—to—hell itself.

Is it any wonder no Catholic wants to investigate or tamper with such dangerous knowledge?

If the same priest who spoke to me years ago would say as much to me now I could give him an answer. But as over twenty years have elapsed, the man with nothing to cling to, brilliant as his intellect was, became the infidel he dreaded. He lost both courage and hope, and went down through the dead waste in the footsteps of some of his unfortunate brethren.

The Roman hierarchy has made wonderful capital of this same sentence of Scripture. Any one reading the eighteenth chapter of St. Matthew by the light of his own understanding will readily perceive the meaning of the text. It relates to matters of *discipline*, and has no bearing whatever on either *faith or doctrine*. The Bible *alone* should be our rule of faith, and the Church is that great body of Christians of all times, headed by spiritual teachers and expounders of the Divine Word, who have the right of government, and who should be called upon to settle all questions of dispute; and he who flies in the face of their warning and will not be guided by their decision must remain forever as a heathen and a publican to the rest of the Christian fold. The text bears no connection

whatever to matters of doctrine, nor to the Pope of Rome except inasmuch as it has been made to do so by the iron links of Romanism.

Thus are lives lost. Young men, full of promise, at the very start of life, gather the fruit of their early training. Beautiful it looks from without; but as their intelligence unfolds and the man's spirit of inquiry comes, as it surely does, in time, to every one with an unstunted mind, he is confronted by the fearful discovery of the awful fact that he has spent the best part of his life safeguarding a puff ball. The knife-prick of investigation tells the fatal truth in the shower of black powder that covers and ruins his entire future.

To attempt to argue with a Romanist is more than futile. Rome allows of no argument; she has forestalled all that. What argument could knock out such a foundation as the Petrine claim? It is useless to attempt to break down Rome's bulwarks by attacks on her vicious tenets. Arrows aimed at the Rock of Gibraltar would prove as deadly. Hammering, however loud, at her brazen portals will die away in mere empty sound.

It matters not how Scripture is twisted, nor what the fathers have invented in hair-splitting contests of doctrinal theology and casuistry. A Catholic, a good Catholic, will tell you he has nothing to do with controversy. It is not for him to criticize, but to receive. What is his judgment compared to the wonderful workings of the minds of the early fathers of sanctity—mythical and real?

Nothing makes any difference, except *Rome!* Rome or the Vatican eternal, which has assumed such vast proportions as to make Heaven her footstool. It is only when a good Catholic becomes a *reasoner*—a bad Romanist—there is some hope for him. Then his mind begins to work, and he goes back to the beginning to find out how he came to be as he is. Even then, though his reason may assert itself, he is so surrounded by superstition and hedged in by life-long customs and habits—an atmosphere and condition unknown to the Protestant mind—it requires a superhuman nerve, almost, to break away and make a dash for freedom from these enchanted grounds of pagan symbolism.

To the priest this is well-nigh impossible. Even with a help-

ing hand few men have courage to come out in the open, and, as St. Paul says: "Stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage." (Gal. 5: 1.) All honor to him who thus asserts himself. The seed of development must be sown at the fountain head; as it grows its roots will strangle the fictitious claims of Rome. The change of thought must come from within and begin at the basic principle of their faith. If you will lend your aid, put yourself in your brother's place, sympathize with him, understand him and lead him to search for himself, by the light of Divine guidance, for Scriptural truth, bearing this in mind: "To be a priest is a grave matter; it makes night in a man's soul; . . . but that which makes night may leave stars."

FRANCES GARWOOD-QUIN.

## A DEFINITION OF BIGOTRY

BY CON TENDER.

"Truth" is the name of a Roman Catholic magazine, which is evidently published for the purpose of catching the unwary. It is smooth, specious and sapient, indeed, at times even verging toward refinement.

It endeavors to explain the beauties of the doctrine of purgatory and similar Roman beliefs, which truly stand in need of explanation, and does it to the supposed delectation of seekers of the right way. But, alas! for its tender object, its cloak of pretense is so scant and worn that, try as it may to appear respectable, the cloven foot is now and again revealed in all its ugliness. To illustrate: In the December, 1913, issue, on page 29, appears the following:

" . . . the 421st anniversary of the landing of Christopher Columbus on Cat Island."—New York Times.

Bigotry (—re), n. (cf. F. *bigoterie*), state of mind of being a bigot; obstinate and unreasoning attachment to one's own belief and opinions, with intolerance of beliefs opposed to them. The persistent malicious misrepresentation of things Catholic by a certain Anglo-Saxon rag published in New York."

Synonym: "New York Times."

That is to say, the "New York Times" is called an "Anglo-Saxon rag" merely because forsooth it mentions the historical fact that Columbus landed on Cat Island.

What is the trouble with "Truth"? What does it want the "Times" to say about Columbus' discovery and landing? Wherein does the "Times'" statement misrepresent things Catholic? Truly we are stumped. What do Catholics want? What does "Truth" want?

Oh, well, who cares what they want? Let us go happily on our way and leave such irascible, fist-shaking, anathematizing falsifiers to their fate.

It has always seemed to us that the "Times" is especially favorable to Romanism, but for all the favor shown, it seems that a single sentence that fails to pass its unfair and ignorant censorship is sufficient to call forth harsh and relentless judgment. Truly, Rome is an unreasonable and tyrannical mistress!

But what about her calling any one else in this great round world a "bigot"? Is it not time to snicker?

But seriously, if "Truth" does this in the green tree, what will it do in the dry?

What kind of history would there be if "Truth" (Rome) had the writing of it? Is there not room here for great play of the imagination?

---

#### **The Bound Volume for 1913**

The index to Vol. XXX. will be published in the January number. Order the Bound Volume for 1913 now. It will be a valuable addition to your library. It is one of the best volumes ever published, containing 448 pages of information that should be preserved and kept at hand. The price is \$1.50 at the office, \$1.70 by mail. We give you the binding free of cost.

---

We receive many commendations like the following:

"THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC is a wonderful magazine, and seems to grow better every month. I only wish it could be in every home."—A Subscriber.

## WHY MUST WE FIGHT THE ROMAN CHURCH ?

BY BISHOP MANUEL FERRANDO, D.D.

The following address was delivered by Bishop Ferrando at a great mass meeting and rally held under the auspices of the Silent Workers of the World, at the Washington Theatre, Newark, N. J., on December 14th, when there was a packed house of about 2,500 people, from which as many more had been turned away for want of room. The Rev. Dr. W. Russell Collins was the chairman at this meeting, and the editors of the "Menace" and of "The American Citizen" were present. Bishop Ferrando's address was received with enthusiastic applause.—C.

Gentlemen :

In taking up my subject, I begin with this question :

Why does America have the reputation of being the greatest nation of the world ?

Do not believe for a moment that you owe your greatness, as a nation, to your tall buildings, to your natural resources of riches, nor to your characteristic activity and daring enterprises.

As the youngest nation of the world, this is expected of you. Energy belongs to the young.

You have had the advantage of being able to profit by the history of other nations. Their experience has been at your disposal, enabling you to make a national selection before the rest of the world was ready to apply such principles to the species.

Your tall buildings, your amazing means of transportation, your world-encircling commerce, the result of your industry, form a new page in the world's history, yet they are almost a repetition of the facts of the early history of all other nations.

I wonder whether the people of old Babylonia, or Nineveh, might not question if their buildings were not more symmetrically proportioned than yours, or their comforts more adequate to human needs. I wonder whether the ancient Phœnicians would not assume that their spirit of commerce and enterprise was not greater than yours, taking into account their limitations and your modern facilities. I wonder whether the builders of the wall of China, or the excavators of the

catacombs, or those who built the pyramids, or the great Temple of the Sun, at Baalbeck, would not minimize the wonders of your subway system and the miracles of modern construction.

I also wonder whether you, as a nation, would be able to sit in judgment to condemn the Rome of old for its political intrigues and its social vices. I am afraid that, were such nations to rise from the dust of ages, they would exclaim with apocalyptic voice, "We know your virtues—and your shortcomings!"

And yet, gentlemen, with the impartiality of one free from prejudice, and full of admiration for you, as a nation, I pronounce my verdict, saying, "Yes, America is a great nation; America is the greatest nation of the world!"

Why? This is a question which, if I were to put it to you to-day, I am sure would call forth numberless different answers and contradictory opinions.

When I was in college, in the country of ancient glories and modern misfortunes, we were asked, "Why did the Americans adopt the Republican form of Government?" The invariable answer was, "Because they did not want to pay taxes."

Our old professor took great delight in adding, "They are a proud and rebellious nation."

I do not know what your answer would be to my question. But I imagine I hear some say, "Because we despise kings and titles; because we have humiliated once great nations; because our products are in demand all over the world; because we have the best government in the world, and so forth, and so forth.

But I have my doubts as to whether human pride has become so dead in you that you despise royalty and aristocracy. We have too often seen young American heiresses go over to Europe with their millions, to exchange them for a ruined title, burdened with debts, only to come back, in many cases, with a divorce and minus their millions.

I have my doubts as to whether it is a glory to have destroyed some old, unserviceable ships, and to have taken away from another nation some possessions which were more of a burden to it than a help. Some might question whether

we are not greatly indebted to Germany and England, as well as other lands, for many importations.

Murphy alone is sufficient to clear our minds on the question of our government.

I, as a foreigner, may not be a competent authority to answer this great question, but as an American citizen and an observer I have my opinion.

At any rate, whatever be the true answer, you will agree with me that the greatness of our nation is not a cause, but an effect.

Gentlemen, allow me to be perfectly frank with you and to speak all my mind upon the subject.

I have stated that you, as a nation, are great—the greatest in the world. But you owe your greatness not to your natural resources, not to your commerce, not to your millions, nor to your field or marine forces.

You owe your greatness to a principle and to a man. This principle is the principle of **Democracy**, and its best interpreter is the man **Lincoln**. Without this principle and this man you would not be what you are.

The motto, "Liberty, Equality and Fraternity" was known in the world before you became a nation. But the perfect conception of it was not understood before Lincoln. The same ships that, in the name of this glorious trinity, fought against England's tyranny, were used, after the war, to bring over to these shores the vaunted stronghold of liberty and equality—the poor Africans, as slaves!

Lincoln, alone, perceiving the error, was courageous enough to demonstrate that it was a good and holy thing to shed our nation's life-blood to give them freedom.

Democracy, with Lincoln, became the foe to all tyrannies, and the hope of the world's redemption from them.

To him all men were as brothers, and his country, in his ideal of it, was a paradise, in which every one might enjoy, on earth, his natural rights as a man.

Any victim of tyranny or oppression who fled to these shores, crying, "Let me live!" ought to find here not only the privilege of living, under shelter of the wings of Liberty, but the opportunity to shine.

So America became great because it offered to each and every man the best opportunities for life—the development and expansion of his own life to all the fulness of which it was capable.

If men of the type of Savonarola and other reformers in theology, philosophy and politics might have had the good fortune of living in America, the world's history would not have registered pages as black as those of the Inquisition, and the mass of humanity would not be so ignorant to-day.

Now, gentlemen, who would think it possible that such a principle as Democracy, and the work of such a man as Lincoln, should be in so great danger of dishonor to-day that we must needs appeal to patriotic sentiment to awake and face the enemy that threatens to destroy our national glory?

Yet that is true. And the enemy, defiant and daring, is no other than that which enthroned and deposed kings at will, which devastated the kingdoms of Europe, has opposed with strong hand every progressive idea, has kept burning the fires of Inquisition by feeding them with human rights, and has infected the air of dungeons with the dead bodies of the apostles of liberty.

This enemy is no other than the Church of Rome, which, after pauperizing Europe, has sent its emissaries to this country, in order to fortify the papal throne with the spoils of American freedom and glory.

Lest we be considered partial, let us examine history now in the making, and see why it is we feel it our urgent duty to call upon American patriotism to face the enemy.

True Democracy is that which values every man according to his true worth. It does away with hereditary privileges, and out of respect for human rights helps each individual to develop his natural capacities.

This mutual aid and respect makes all men partakers in the building of a nation and sharers in its glories.

True Democracy opens its arms to the oppressed of all nations and forms of them a peculiar people, whose life reaches its highest expression in the formation of heroes; and these, in turn, like shining lights reflect their glory back upon all the citizens. As the nation gives life and development to the

citizen, it is but natural that the citizen, in return, should give his life and strength to the nation. Therefore he must deny allegiance to every foreign power, in order to be faithful to his adopted country.

Every citizen who, availing himself of the privileges of Democracy, secretly retains his allegiance to another nation, is a traitor and destroyer.

The Roman Church came to this country as a deceiver and a traitor. She came with the very kiss of Judas. At the same time she was praising your Democratic principles, she was plotting their destruction and was doing her best to nip these very principles in the bud as they began to appear in Europe.

Her despotic government there became so intolerable that her eldest daughter, France, and her beloved Italy, in spite of her motherly maledictions and threatenings of hell-fire, made the final break with her.

But to this country she came like a thief, who in the name of charity would take your money. Appealing to your Democracy, she came to destroy Democracy.

And now, finding Americans so easily duped, her next move will be to invite you, revolver in hand, to kneel to the pope, who, being lord of Heaven and earth, will be merciful if he allows you to live, even if it be in a dungeon.

If there were no other reason besides this allegiance to a foreign power it would be enough cause to deny the Roman Church the right to establish herself in this country. But the more potent reason for which every true American should fight against her encroachments with all the energy of patriotism, is that her purpose strikes at the very root of Democracy.

If history and reason did not convince us of this fact, Father Phelan, one of the Roman pioneers of the West, would relieve our minds of any doubt.

"Of course," says Father Phelan, "the pope is above the State." Should the pope and the Government of the United States disagree, to hell with the Government of the United States!"

You have, then, the phenomenon of the citizens of a free nation surrendering their liberty, not only of conscience but of action, at the feet of a man whom they did not elect.

The Roman Church came here in the name of Democracy, to minister to those of her special form of belief, that they need not make the sacrifice of their religion, while in Europe, she was plotting with the Powers to establish Roman Catholic colonies.

Those who understood her policy could easily see that it was not religious, but political interest that brought her here. If the pope had intended to renounce his political claims and give to his subjects merely the principles of Christianity, he ought to have kept his priests and nuns in Europe, where the religious principles were being shaken, and to let his people come here to learn Christianity in a country where the Bible was the acknowledged rule of faith and practise.

But, alas! the Roman admirers of your country, with words of flattery in their mouth and destructive plans in their hearts, soon began to show their aims by establishing missions to convert the Americans, as if you were heathen, and filling the White House with advisors so as to modify the Government. So those who first came as admirers have become reformers, with a purpose of preparing the way to represent Lincoln and your other heroes as mere visionaries or lunatics, and your past glorious history as a piece of human folly.

But have they really made any progress in this respect? To many who are asleep it may appear that they have made none. To any awakened mind their progress in this country is simply astounding.

Sixteen years ago I was insulted by a Protestant minister because I foretold the progress of the Roman Church. He insisted on proving by statistics that it was losing ground. I told him that Rome does not count its progress by numbers, but by the transformation of the sentiments of the people. The history of the past few years confirms my prediction.

Some years ago the Catholics were afraid to show their colors. I well remember having seen their churches so destitute of images that I once took one of them for a Protestant church. Their policy at that time was, "Nothing that may shock Puritanical prejudice. Let us discredit the fanaticism of Spain and Central and South America." To-day there are

more fanatical practises here than there are in old Spain; even the shinbones of saints that have lost their miraculous virtue there, have been brought here and proven so powerful that even some Protestants have tried their efficacy.

Some years ago the Roman Catholics did not dare to use the public press, even for their notices; to-day the Protestants can only advertise their church services by virtue of the attractiveness of their money.

Some years ago a Catholic took great pains not to reveal his religion when he was looking for a job; even some servant girls, if they were employed in a Protestant house in the region of 42d Street, used to go up-town to a Catholic church, and on the way back would pass by some Protestant church to get a bulletin to show the mistress in order that she might believe them to be Protestants.

To-day, if one Protestant goes to another looking for a job, he finds it most advantageous to make believe he is a Catholic. Does that not reveal a change of sentiment? More yet! Patriotic manifestations and national customs were observed by Catholics with such fidelity that some Protestants believed them more loyal to the Government and the country than the very American-born.

Such patriotic and national gatherings have cooled down. Washington's and Lincoln's birthdays are holidays which are taken little notice of, except by the school children. Soon they may cease to be observed, for the convenience of commerce, while Columbus Day grows in prominence.

Columbus, of course, is represented as the devout Catholic, who through faith, and God's providence, conquered for the pope a new world! America, being predestined, but having strayed away, must be brought back to her first allegiance.

And can we look on to see the last remnant of our sacred memories disturbed, without a national uprising in protest? The characteristic feast of America, which was so faithfully observed by our forefathers, the Day of Thanksgiving, founded by the Puritans, who hated everything that savored of popery—that day that for centuries has brought together the scattered members of families, at however great sacrifice to accomplish it; the day in which prisoners were par-

doned and restored to their homes; the day on which you could count the growth of each household, as its members sat in their accustomed places of worship—this day has been chosen as the one on which to celebrate the Pan-American mass, representing the federation of the Pan-American republics, and, to those who have eyes to see, plainly aiming at the supremacy of the Church over the State.

And our President makes a show of his religious, national and political apostasy by attending it.

And yet, so subtle has been Rome's working that there are still some who question as to whether she is gaining or losing!

But how has Rome made this alarming progress? The method is very simple, but it is not generally understood.

Rome's conquests are made, not by open warfare, but by subtlety, and her progress is that of the snake, silently dragging its slimy coils through the grass, until it reaches the place where it can strike to kill.

Rome's power consists in the self-surrender of her leaders to the supreme object of the advancement of the Church. Her glory is their glory. One pope or prelate prepares the way for his successor, in the great plan laid hundreds of years ago. One after another contributes his little share to the furtherance of the Church's schemes with admirable self-abnegation, worthy of a better cause, not seeking personal credit, willing to sink into oblivion if only the cause of the Church be furthered.

I know of many instances where notable books have been written by some obscure monk, and the authorship ascribed to his superior, as that would bring the greater glory and prestige to his convent.

Popes, themselves ignorant and incompetent, have promulgated decrees and issued *motus proprios*, framed by the cardinals, and have been given all the credit, as redounding to the Church's greater glory.

In contrast, many religious or social movements outside the Roman Church have arisen with some one man, centered about him, and died with him, or lost much of their power at his death.

It is this wonderful organization, each individual performing his own part in the great machine, which is the secret of the power of the Roman Church.

Time, space, human life are nothing to her but tools, which she makes use of, without scruple or consideration, as it suits her purpose.

When a new pope is to be elected all the proceedings are surrounded by mystery, which the outer world cannot penetrate. The first step is to lay down the policy to be observed by the Church during the next pontificate, and the second is to elect a man to occupy the papal throne, who will be willing to carry out this policy, or at least to submit to the will of his counsellors.

If one of the candidates should be a man of independence who disagreed with the policy laid down, and who was not willing to accept the pontificate under these conditions, he immediately asks to have his name removed from the candidature and thus simplifies the election.

Rome knows well how to bind her high officials by bonds of obligation and gratitude, so that they may not be tempted to act with independence, but may be forced, by the very dignities conferred upon them, to carry out her plans implicitly.

Why is it that an obscure Franciscan monk was chosen to be the last papal delegate to this country and a humble missionary from China the present one? Simply because the Church's purpose is not to minister intelligently to the spiritual needs of her own people in this country. (For that she might better choose a man like Cardinal Gibbons, who, having lived here so long, is fully conversant with conditions.)

No, her object is to "make America Catholic," so she chooses some obscure man, obliges him to go to Rome and study court etiquette that he may know how to behave in polite society, and so overwhelms him with a sense of the honor and dignity conferred upon him that he becomes her abject slave, only too eager to fulfil to the letter every detail of the Church's policy and every instruction delivered to him. He knows that for him all depends upon his performing well his commission; and if he is successful, Rome removes him, at the height of his success, and rewards him with a promo-

tion, not, as he imagines, to manifest her approbation, but to prevent his success from turning his head and tempting him to become self-sufficient and independent.

Rome's great plan is to weaken all power and obscure all glory which is not her own; and to this end she works to undermine the strongholds of the nation and gradually to gain influence in all the affairs of Government.

It will be noted that her steps at first were most cautious, gradually growing bolder and bolder.

A call upon the President by the papal delegate, simply to pay his respects; later, an occasion such as the inauguration of the Catholic University at Washington, provided an opportunity of inviting the President to be present; and soon, little by little, each delegate, building upon the foundations laid by his predecessor, being instructed just how far he must venture, and no farther, has wormed his way into the most intimate social relation with the White House. Suave suggestions were made, at the proper moment, concerning the advisability of manifesting a more perfect democratic spirit by the appointment of Roman Catholics to this or that public office, so it has come about that a letter of introduction from Cardinal Gibbons, or the papal delegate, is a better recommendation than any other, and little by little not only the whole fabric of the nation's political life has become infiltrated with Roman poison, but the very laws of the land are being modified without many of us realizing it. Where does all this lead?

It leads inevitably to a complete destruction of our national principles, and therefore of our peace, happiness and greatness.

Take, for example, the Roman marriage law, embodied in the **Ne Temere** decree. Could anything have been invented better adapted for the breaking up of one of our most sacred institutions, the American home? Could anything have been devised which would more surely bring about the separation of children from parents and husbands from wives, at the same time sanctioning social evils under the cloak of religion, depriving the people of their peace and subjecting them more completely to the Church? In connection with this, we must

consider the power of the priest in the confessional. There another man, if he so chooses, may come between a husband and wife simply because he is a priest. By means of the confessional it is that Rome chiefly wields her power over the mind and heart; there she binds or perverts the will; there she sanctions iniquity, counsels injustice, ruins and poisons pure minds; in a word, the confessional is Rome's laboratory.

We have not time to do more than to touch upon the subject of the convents, scattered all over this fair land, within whose walls untold suffering and tyranny and injustice exist—centres of white slavery, whose doors are closed to all but those who can be duped by the outward show of sanctity.

How it is they are not willing to submit to Government inspection, nor to any kind of regulation?

How is it that other charitable institutions are subject to inspection and the Government is partial to them alone in this respect?

In the convent schools are hundreds and hundreds of Protestant girls, in whose minds the nuns are inculcating, without appearing to do so, subtle ideas which shall tend to undermine Protestantism.

Then consider the question of the public schools. Rome leagued herself with the Jews for the sake of removing the Bible from the public schools, to avoid sectarianism, only to turn about and denounce them as deficient because they give no religious instruction.

Hence the need of the parochial school is emphasized and the appropriation of public funds for the purpose urged.

As reasonably might Presbyterians, Methodists, or any other Protestant church ask for the appropriation of public funds for their own denominational schools.

But the object of Rome is plain. It is to make the public schools so insignificant, and the parochial schools so important, that they will come to be the schools of the land, supported by the Government. So an immense step will be taken toward the union of Church and State, which means making America Catholic.

Gentlemen, I realize that I have imposed upon your patience, yet I feel I have said but little of what might be said

upon this burning question. But the points I have touched upon should be sufficient to arouse every true American to the defense of the traditions and glories of his country, which are menaced by this deadly enemy. I am neither visionary nor pessimistic; I **know** whereof I speak. Bitter personal experience has impressed the lesson upon my mind and heart.

Danger threatens! Now is the time to strike! Indifference and apathy are fatal, while the enemy makes rapid advance in its destructive course.

This is no time to adopt a covert or uncertain policy. The enemy itself has come forth openly enough into the battlefield and challenged us. Not to meet it in order to rebuff its attacks is to be a traitor to one's country.

We ought to openly and boldly form a federation of the press, which should valiantly defend American principles and fearlessly reveal the vileness of Romanism and the corruption of its priests. We ought to form patriotic societies, which should be wisely and strongly organized, to revive and uphold our national traditions, not setting aside the religious issue to devote themselves merely to the political side of the matter, but finding their strength and inspiration in the Bible, so beloved by the Pilgrim Fathers, and which was the source of their greatness.

Above all, we ought to form an anti-clerical party, whose object should be to prevent the influence of the Vatican from penetrating to the White House and all the offices of State, and to purify our national politics. Let us also pronounce a new **Ne Temere**, warning our young men not to lavish their intentions upon any handmaid of the Vatican whose thoughts and actions are governed by a priest.

Gentlemen, I grant that the progress Romanism has made in this country is so great that it is enough to dishearten any one who knows not how to count upon the forces of an inspired will.

But when we consider that the greatest political movements of the world have been effected by the few and the weak, according to this world's judgment; when we see that the more inadequate the means the greater is the hero; when

we consider that the formation of this great nation is owing to the decision of a handful of brave souls who rebelled against spiritual slavery, and later to the courage of those who resisted political tyranny, hope springs up within our hearts and we cannot believe that the descendants of the Pilgrims, of Washington and Lincoln, will fail in this new national crisis. Let us rise as one man, and the greater the triumphs and advance of Romanism have been, the more complete will be her shame and confusion when the glorious banner of the Stars and Stripes rejects with indignation those who attempt to place it below the papal flag!

And American sentiment shall throw the keys of St. Peter into the sea, and shall say to him who claims the power to use them, "These keys shall never lock the manacles upon the hands of the sons of Liberty!"

### THE PROTECTION OF NATIONAL LIBERTY IS NOT "RELIGIOUS BIGOTRY"

The following letter from the Rev. Dr. W. Russell Collins, of THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC, was sent to the "New York Times" on December 1st. As Dr. Collins expected, it was returned with the following polite stereotyped note:

"The editor regrets that the enclosed manuscript is not available for publication in 'The New York Times.'"

The newspapers do not dare publish criticisms of Romanism, political or theological or moral. A reporter said to Dr. Collins, apologetically, "We never attack." That is not true. The press freely attacks those whom it does not fear. Its attacks in political campaigns are sometimes vindictive and scurrilous. And to please Rome it often attacks and condemns the opponents of Rome. But it never attacks Rome, because it stands in dread of Roman boycott. The Jewish editor and publisher, and the Protestant editor and publisher are as much under Roman censorship and control as the Roman editor and publisher. The "Times" made an editorial attack upon those who condemned the attendance of the President at a Roman political mass. The papers do attack; but they do not attack the Roman Catholic hierarchy.—W. R. C.

To the Editor of the "New York Times":

Monday's "Times" published an interview with a "prominent member of the Knights of Columbus," criticizing the organization of a new American Patriotic Association, announced in the same article in the "Times," in which the critic is quoted as saying, "It is sad to reflect that men are

so blinded by religious bigotry as to publish such an appeal to creed prejudice."

I am not a member of the A. P. A., and know nothing about the organization, except that which I have read in the "Times," and I am unacquainted with its promoters. And I am not a member of any secret or non-secret order of any kind. I voted for Mayor-elect Mitchel and other Roman Catholics on the ticket. This statement will, perhaps, relieve me of inclusion in the charge of being "blinded by religious bigotry" in my political holdings at least.

But, as a plain, loyal American citizen, I wish to challenge that accusation, so commonly made by Romanists, particularly in their denominational press, against those who organize themselves into associations for the protection of our cherished American liberties.

Protective measures do not always indicate the presence of danger. The maintenance of an army and a navy does not indicate that war is expected from any particular quarter. When I lock my door at night against burglars it is not because I am aware of the plot of any particular burglar. But if any man objects to the locking of my door, I may then be at liberty to believe that he has designs upon my property. If any nation objects to our armament, we may well suspect that that nation has designs upon our territory and rights.

And if any organization objects to the constitution of such associations as The Guardians of Liberty, or The American Protective Association, then we may well suspect the loyalty and integrity of the objecting body. Every loyal American citizen, whether Protestant, Roman or Jew, in religion, or of no religion, should welcome such protective associations.

The only organized body that raises an outcry against such protective institutions, is the Roman Church. And there must be a reason.

If the reason be given that these organizations protest against the interference of the Roman Church in American politics, then there must be a reason; for large bodies of intelligent men are unlikely to make such protest without cause.

It must be clearly borne in mind that the Roman Church represents two distinct principles: A religious principle and a political principle. These two principles are not necessarily mutually dependent, yet under the hierarchical dominion they are become mutually dependent.

With the religious principle I have nothing to do as an American citizen. Our country, being constitutionally one of religious liberty, I am unconcerned, as a citizen, with the religious belief, or the want of one, of my fellow citizen and voter, provided that he makes no attempt to make use of political means to establish his religious institution or to force the adoption of his religious views upon others.

As a teacher of religious truth, it is my right and duty to oppose error, and to convert men, if possible, to my thinking, by means of controversy, teaching and moral suasion. And in so doing I must not deny that right to others.

But as an American citizen and voter, I am concerned with no man's religion, unless it corrupt the morals of the nation. Therefore, as a citizen and voter, I am unconcerned with the religion of the Romanist. If he chooses to believe in the materialistic and cannibalistic dogma of transubstantiation, or chooses to worship a woman as God, and to pray to dead men and women, or believes in the miraculous healing potency of an alleged piece of a dead woman's shinbone, all that is no business of mine as a voter.

But the Roman Church is the only ecclesiastical body in the world claiming political sovereignty of the universe. When an institution has for its watchword, "The pope is king," then American citizens have a right to demand that the members of that institution keep away from the polls of our American Republic. When a representative priest of that institution, editor of one of its most influential newspapers, a favorite at the Vatican, says, "Tell us, in the conflict between the Church and the civil government we take the side of the Church; of course we do. Why, if the Government of the United States were at war with the Church, we would say to-morrow, 'To hell with the Government of the United States!'" (Western Watchman, Roman Catholic newspaper, June 27, 1912), then we must demand that the holders of such

political doctrine keep away from the polls. No man can serve two masters. He whose first loyalty is to the pope, a foreign potentate, cannot be loyal to the American Government.

And this Roman Catholic editor is not an extremist. He is a representative of the Vatican. The pope claims, and has always claimed, to be king of kings and lord of lords throughout the world. He holds that princes should receive their crowns from his hand, and govern by his permission and under his direction. The professed ambition of the Roman Church to-day is to make America Roman Catholic that the pope may reign as the American sovereign. The pope is, politically, a sovereign within certain territorial bounds enclosing the Vatican. He claims to be a prisoner because his jurisdiction is limited by these territorial bounds. And it is the fixed purpose of his Church to extend the line of these bounds, if it be possible to do so, until there shall be no bounds; and this purpose includes the political conquest of America as well as of all other nations. And America is the sovereign pope's last hope. The older nations that have been under his sovereignty have found it no easy yoke to bear. They began to declare their independence in the sixteenth century, when Germany and England cast off the yoke. Later France asserted her political independence. Then Italy awakened—Italy, the birthplace and cradle, the home and the stronghold of the papacy and its seat of government, dethroned the pope as king and limited his territorial sovereignty to the bounds of the Vatican. Recently Portugal has attained her freedom, and Spain, the pope's right arm of political power, is refusing him longer servitude. America is the last hope of the Vatican, and the cry and watchword now is "to make America Roman Catholic."

Let the Romanist believe what he likes in theology, but he must not be given governmental power or control until he forswears political allegiance to an Italian emperor at the Vatican. And it is to protect American citizenship from the encroachments of this foreign political power that calls for such protective associations as those under discussion.

You will ask, why then did I vote for a Romanist? Be-

cause when there is a choice of only two who could hope for election, the best interests of good government demanded a vote for the better of the two. I believe Mr. Mitchel to be a good, clean man, who will give us good government as far as he is able. But he and every Romanist knows that his first duty is to his pope and those in authority under his pope. The Knights of Columbus is not professedly a political organization. Tammany was originally only a society of gentlemen without political motive—so of the Knights of Columbus. But it is absurd to imagine that such an organization will not obey as a body the mandate of their sovereign, or that they will not and do not associate themselves in the election of their favorite sons.

Protection of American liberty, then, is not bigotry, but is patriotism. And the bigot is he who calls it bigotry.

WILLIAM RUSSELL COLLINS.

---

## THE PRESIDENT

### And the "Pan-American" Political Thanksgiving Mass

BY PROF. W. RUSSELL COLLINS, D.D.

The "New York Times" on November 29, 1913, published the following editorial criticism of the vast majority of our population who are indignant at the attendance of the President of the United States and his staff of executives upon a Union of State and Church political mass, on our national Thanksgiving Day, in the Church of the Roman obedience, which acclaims the pope king of the universe:

#### "MISDIRECTED CRITICISM.

"It is only too easy to understand the sincerity of the feeling underlying the criticism by some of the Protestant clergy of the action of President Wilson in attending the Pan-American Thanksgiving mass in Washington. Dr. Mackay, of the Presbyterian Church, probably expressed the sentiment really felt by all the others. It is a sentiment of jealous pride in one's 'own Church.' It often goes with hearty and self-sacrificing devotion, and it is the root of much genuine and valuable service.

"We confess that it appears to us a little narrow, and not quite in harmony with the spirit of true Christianity. No one can doubt the attachment of the President to 'his' Church, but it does not seem to require, on a public occasion, when the representatives of friendly States were meeting at a religious ceremony intended to celebrate and consecrate the tie that binds them to us and to each other, that

the President should absent himself because the ceremony was not held in a Presbyterian church and with Presbyterian rites. The great body of our fellow Americans of the South happen to be Catholics. A very considerable part of the people of our own country are also Catholics. The attendance of the President at St. Patrick's Church on Thanksgiving was but a proper expression of sympathy with the sentiment of the occasion."

It is useless to attempt reply to this condemnation of our Protestant citizens, in the columns of the "Times," because it is quite plain that the position of the public press is generally favorable to the Roman dominion and seems to be subsidized by it, so that when news matter appears bearing upon the differences between the Roman hierarchy and kingdom and the anti-Roman American citizenship, the newspaper report is usually prejudicial against the patriotic citizenship and favorable to the alien subjects of the papal sovereignty.

I shall, therefore, attempt to give reply to the "Times" and to the supporters of the "Times'" position in these pages. To the editor of the "New York Times":

I must agree with your Roman Catholic correspondent, W. R. Jones, that your editorial, "Misdirected Criticism," "certainly must have pleased thousands of your readers"—thousands of your Roman Catholic readers, together with the pope and the political hierarchy governing them.

But it could hardly have given pleasure to the vastly greater millions of loyal American citizens who are opposed to the political dominion of papal Rome, and who fall under the condemnation of your unpatriotic criticism.

It is claimed that there are 15,000,000 Romanists in this country, and that this procedure of our President and officers of State was merely an act of courtesy to them.

May I inquire, does the President owe no act of courtesy to our other eighty-five or more millions of Americans on our national Thanksgiving Day? For seven successive years past, if I am un mistaken, the President and the officers of State, have ignored our 85,000,000 of patriotic Americans on the national day of thanksgiving to do honor to 15,000,000 subjects of the alien papal sovereignty, until this practise has become a custom unknown in all former Administrations since the foundation of our American republic.

Can an act be an act of courtesy if, however good be the inten-

tion, in giving courtesy to three-twentieths of the population, it is directly insulting to seventeen-twentieths of the population?

It is a great mistake to regard the question under discussion as a matter of religious controversy, as some of your correspondents and your editorial seem to regard it. So regarded there is an appeal to religious prejudice and even bigotry, which should be eliminated.

So regarded, however, certain questions may legitimately be asked.

First. Why does the President of the United States set a bad example to the citizens of the country by proclaiming a day of national thanksgiving and prayer, calling upon the people throughout the land to assemble in their several places of worship to render thanks to Almighty God, and then for seven successive years past fail to attend his own place of worship to give thanks on that day?

Second. Why does he on that national holy day attend a place of worship contrary and opposed to his religious belief (no matter what his religious belief may be) in which he cannot honestly participate in the worship, because he does not believe in it? Does the President in so doing intend to teach the people that national religious demonstration is all a hollow mockery, and that it is not required in men that they shall be honest in their worship and thanksgiving? Is this the teaching our Presidents would give the youth of our land, Roman and non-Roman alike? This question carries with it no condemnation of the Roman Catholic Church for reciting mass on Thanksgiving Day. It is a question of the honesty of the President and of his example in honesty of worship set to the nation on that day. Would Cardinal Gibbons regard himself an honest man if he should make his thanksgiving on that day in a Hebrew synagogue under the Jewish form of worship, or in the Mormon temple, or in a Unitarian church, or in a Protestant church? Would he commend such an example to his followers? Yet he commends such dishonest example, leading to religious anarchy, in the President, for whose private religion he has no respect. If the President were a Roman Catholic there could be no religious criticism of his attendance at mass in his own house of worship upon the national day of thanksgiving. His act, in so doing, would be regarded as the

faithful act of a private citizen in the performance of his duty. No criticism is made of Chief Justice White, nor of Associate Justice McKenna, who are Roman Catholics, for performing their religious duties in attending mass on that day. Their act was honest. The act of the President and of the non-Roman members of his cabinet and other State officials, conjointly, was dishonest, and has been so for seven successive years past.

Third. If, contrary to the spirit of the Constitution of the United States, which, providing freedom of religious worship, gives recognition to no particular form of worship, the President finds it in his heart to give the formal recognition and commendation of the Government to particular religious bodies, on the national days of worship, by official and stately attendance at their houses of worship, we are then justified in asking why should he be partial in this dispensation of the honors of the State by confining this favor to one particular religious body for seven consecutive years? It must be borne in mind that the President attends these religious functions not as a private citizen as he would attend his own house of worship, but with his cabinet he attends them as the President of the United States with his officers of State. If the State must in this manner violate the spirit of the Constitution, then why do not the President and his cabinet make official visits to the houses of worship of all our religious bodies on our national day of thanksgiving and prayer? Will the President and his cabinet give public thanks in the synagogue of our loyal Hebrew citizens on Thanksgiving Day? Will they thus make public recognition of the temple of our Mormon citizens (which God forbid)? If the President may confer the honors of the State upon one religion, in which he does not believe, then he may as validly do so to the favor of another religion in which he does not believe, however absurd its tenets, and he is in justice bound to do so wherever there are loyal citizens, of whatever, sound or unsound, orthodox, heretical or even heathen, belief and manner of worship. This may sound very absurd, but it is logical conclusion if the officers of State are determined to violate the spirit of the Constitution in any case.

But the President, with his cabinet, has chosen in seven consecutive years to confer the honors of the State upon one religious body. And this is well calculated to excite religious

hatred and bigotry and religious war in spirit if not in act.

Still pursuing the matter as a religious discussion, though improperly, the condemnation falls hard upon the religious body thus honored by our Chief Executive and his officers of State. Let it be remembered, this religious body invites these officers of State to give attendance upon its most important office of worship—the celebration of mass. Yet this same religious body forbids, in its canons, the presence, at the celebration of mass, of persons not of its religious belief. This canon may be found in the theology of Liguori and of all the theologians of the Roman Church.

If one will be at the pains of reading the Canon Excommunicato XI., quæst. 3 of the Roman Church, he will find it there stated that it is not permitted to say mass in the presence of any heretic or unbeliever in the doctrines of the Roman Church. By the rule of this canon the recital of mass must not be begun if any persons are present who are not communicants of the Roman Church. And if, the saying of mass having been begun, such persons come into the congregation, the recital must be stopped until they are expelled. And if the priest has proceeded so far as the consecration of the elements, and such persons, who are called heretics, are found in the congregation, and if it be impossible to expel them, then the priest must himself, at once, consume the consecrated elements in whole, and shall not proceed further in the service.

According to the rule of the Roman Church President Wilson and his two predecessors in office, and the Protestant members of their cabinets, and other non-Roman officers of State, are heretics.

Yet these American Roman priests, unfaithful to the doctrine and law of their Church, have not only, in these successive seven years, said mass in the presence of these heretics, but have openly and publicly invited their presence, and have made it their boast. According to their own theology and rule they are guilty of sacrilege and blasphemy, and are automatically under the curse of excommunication. And so the Roman Church, in this country, teaches men to blaspheme on the national day of thanksgiving. No censure of this procedure comes from the Vatican; and, of course, the conclusion is that the Vatican is in collusion with

the American hierarchy in the violation of the rule and doctrine of the Church, and necessarily for private political reasons that are well discerned by thoughtful minds. This is demonstrative of the fact that the doctrine of the Roman Church is the doctrine of convenience in preference for that which is held by that Church to be the doctrine of Truth.

Here I am through with the religious controversy that has been lugged into this discussion by the press for the engendering of religious bigotry and hate.

The majority of critics have lost sight of the real question involved in this violation of American principle.

The real question is one of diplomacy concerning the relation of Church and State, and particularly concerning the relation between the Government of the United States and the Roman Church, which claims political sovereignty over every State Government.

No other Church claims the right to govern the State. State officers may make their compliments to any other Church without involving the State or the dignity of the State. But when the officers of State make their bow to the Church of Rome they do obeisance to the supreme pontiff, who wears the triple crown, and who claims political sovereignty in every State and in every throne, and who is a self-styled prisoner in the Vatican, because the States beyond the borders of the Vatican, where he rules as king, have repudiated his sovereignty. He accepts no greeting from any living being as from an equal, but only as from a subject doing him the proper obeisance to which he claims title. Cardinals are princes of State under him, representing him. Bishops are the nobles of State in the same manner, and under them priests are officers of State. When our Government gives official recognition to this hierarchy it gives recognition to another, a foreign State, which claims sovereignty over our national Government, as over all States, and whose subjects are permitted to vote at our polls with the ultimate purpose of acquiring the sovereignty claimed by their papal king.

This would give sufficient reason for objection to the attendance upon any Roman mass by our officers of State in their official capacity.

But the Roman mass under discussion is styled "The Pan-American Mass."

The title is impudent enough, meaning the mass of all the Americas, whereas it is unauthorized by seventeen-twentieths of our own population, and is not at all represented by the Canadian Government, and has no legislative authorization whatever.

It is an institution of the Roman Church alone, for the celebration of the peace existing between American republics, supposedly of the Roman obedience.

All Churches might well unite in thanksgiving to Almighty God for national peace. And there can be no criticism of those of the Roman religion who give such thanks after the manner of their worship.

But when the Roman State undertakes to assume the patronage of that peace and to celebrate it in its State religion, with the assumption that that is the religion of the States participant in such peace relations, then we have consummate impudence, of which our officers of State have been made the dupes.

And this is just exactly the status of the case. It is claimed that the religion of the States associated in this alliance, except the United States, is the Roman religion. And, albeit, these Latin-American States, all together, represent in population not more than half the population of the United States, yet courtesy demands that 85,000,000 of our population, far more than the total Latin American population, should be ignored, snubbed—yes, insulted—in order to do honor to our Latin neighbors by giving official recognition to what is claimed to be their State religion, by our highest national civil executives on a national day of thanksgiving and worship instituted by the Puritan and Protestant founders of this republic and nation of religious freedom.

In this act our President and national executives acknowledge that the Roman religion is the State religion of the Latin republics, and they thereby give approval of the doctrine of the union of State and Church—the Church governing the State.

Moreover, the President and his official attendants sit in a pew among the subjects of the Roman State and hierarchy, while the cardinal sits in a throne as a prince of the Church and of the State. And the President, unintentionally, or otherwise,

tacitly admits the princely sovereignty of the cardinal and of his sovereign the pope. And in so doing the President humbles and mortifies the 85,000,000 or more of our free American citizens who refuse to bow to a sovereign pope or to acknowledge the princely right and sovereignty of a plebeian Irish lad who has received churchly honors.

The fact that I am in no error in this statement is amply demonstrated in the claims of the Roman press that this "Pan-American Mass" is a permanent, national and official institution, and that it has given forth this report in order that the old world nations which have repudiated papal sovereignty may come to believe that the progressive United States has become officially Roman Catholic. This argument is used for the urging of the claims of the Church to rule the State in the nations which have repudiated such claims. And it is for this reason the Roman Church is willing to commit what her theology teaches is blasphemy at her altars in America.

And this procedure is part of the program to make America Roman Catholic by fooling Protestant officials into yielding unworthy courtesy and giving unworthy favors to the Roman Church and State.

I am willing to believe that men whose training has been entirely political may not understand these things and may be deceived. But it is hard to believe that the former president of Princeton University, the seat of Presbyterian Protestantism in America, should be blinded and should not have committed this grievous error with his eyes wide open. He is an educated man, and is not ignorant in such matters. So much the more shame to him! He argues that he is unwilling to break an established precedent. There he becomes a Roman cat's-paw. And there he is untrue, for he has already broken many other far older and far better established precedents. Our republic is now 137 years old, and its Protestant colonial foundation 150 to 200 years older. And no such custom as this has been known in this land until within six or seven years. Shall the custom of Presidents who have been under the control of the Roman State for a half-dozen years past be regarded as an established precedent to be followed in contradiction to the precedent established in the custom of centuries? The President begs the question, and

the press begs the question. Money rules the latter, and Rome controls the money with the boycott. Votes rule the former, and Rome claims to control the votes.

But President and press are both mistaken. Rome ruined Taft. Rome ruins all whom she favors and all whom she uses. And Rome will ruin Wilson if he is not warned in time. But he is averse to warnings, for protests mighty in volume and strong and earnest came to him from all over the country, by mail and by wire, before he bowed to Rome. Yet he bowed in spite of the many millions of Protestants who put him into office trusting him not to be a Roman tool. Rome did not elect Wilson. Rome wanted to elect Taft. When Rome discovered that Taft had lost his office because of his service to Rome she abandoned Taft to his fate, as she abandons all unpopular servants, however faithful to her interests, and sought favor with Wilson in order to claim for herself the glory of his election. But Wilson was elected by Protestant, or rather non-Roman, votes, and would have been so elected had every Roman vote been cast against him. If he should be a candidate for re-election he will be defeated by Protestant and non-Roman votes.

The 85,000,000 are awakening. There is a low rumbling sound in the air—the sound portending a tremendous earthquake, in which the princes of the papal State will be hurled back to beyond the Tiber and to the confines of the Vatican garden, where they belong. America will never become a papal State nor Roman Catholic. Easy-going for a while, American citizens will fight for their cherished liberties when they are aroused, and they are awakening now. We shall soon have an anti-clerical party in politics for the elimination of priestly interference in the affairs of State. And that party will sweep the country with its votes at the polls. Rome usually outwits herself in the long reach. And by making dupes of our Presidents she has made a master stroke for her own political destruction in this country.

---

“That was a fine letter to Cardinal Gibbons on the nunnery question. I hope Ferrando will take off his gloves and go bare-handed at the nuns. I have subscribed for *THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC* over twenty years, and read it from cover to cover.”—Subscriber.

### THE HOLY DONKEY

That Roman Catholicism is the negation of Christianity is proved by the fact that the so-called Holy Donkey is still worshiped in Italy. Christ taught His followers to worship the Father in the following words: "The hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshipers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship Him. God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth." (John 4: 23, 24.) How can the teaching of our blessed Lord be reconciled with the teaching of the Church of Rome? With reference to the worship of the "Holy Donkey," the Rev. G. Silva, writing to a friend, a letter, dated 15 April, 1910, from Verona (Italy), which appeared in the "Protestant Observer," June, 1910, says: "The priests cannot deny that that chapel was called, officially, up to about seventy years ago, 'The Chapel of the Holy Ass,' and that only since the people commenced to cast ridicule on that designation have the priests sought to make it disappear, and have given it, in the guide for tourists, the name of 'The Chapel of the Entry into Jerusalem.'" The same pastor, in writing to another friend a letter which appears in the same issue of the "Protestant Observer," says: "Verona is not in a remote corner of Italy; it is one of the biggest towns of Italy, and in the north, where the people are more advanced. La Chiesa del Santa Maria di Organo is one of the principal parish churches of Verona and has about 4,000 parishoners. The altar on which the "holy ass" is placed is the altar of the highest importance after the high altar in this church, because exactly to the right of the high altar. It is a fact that in Italy an image of the holy ass in Verona is still an object of worship and veneration by the Italian people. I went on Palm Sunday to the church—not during the religious function—and I saw the ass exposed in the middle of the lighted candles on the altar, and before the altar rails various people kneeling—one told me that during the morning they had celebrated masses before the ass."

Moreover, the worship of the ass in the Church of Rome was not confined to Italy. It was done in France in early times according to "Russel's History of Modern Europe," Vol. 1, p. 189. The evidence before us is contained in a book called "An

Introduction to the Literary History of the Bible," by James Townley, D.D., and published in 1828. This is what the author says, on page 148: "Of the degraded state of religion in the tenth century and of the wretched superstition which reigned in that and some of the following ages, no stronger proof can be adduced than the institution of the Feast of the Ass, celebrated in several churches of France, in commemoration of the Virgin Mary's flight into Egypt. A young girl, richly dressed, with a child in her arms, was placed upon an ass, superbly caparisoned. The ass was led to the altar in solemn procession. High Mass was said with great pomp. The ass was taught to kneel at proper places; a ludicrous composition, half Latin, half French, was sung with great vociferation, of which the following is a free translation:

"From the country of the East  
Came this strong and handsome beast;  
This able ass beyond compare,  
Heavy loads and packs to bear.

CHORUS.

Now, Seignior Ass, a noble bray,  
That beauteous mouth at large display;  
Abundant food our hay-lofts yield,  
And oats abundant load the field."

There are nine verses in all; but we refrain from quoting any more, as the subject is too solemn for ridicule and calls for severe condemnation. Nowhere in the Bible are we taught to worship any person who is not a member of the blessed Trinity. To worship a brute beast is paganism.

Dr. Townley concludes the matter by saying: "When the ceremony was ended, the priest, instead of the usual words with which he dismissed the people, brayed three times like an ass, and the people, instead of the usual response, brayed three times in return."

May the day soon dawn when our Father in Heaven will be worshiped by all people in spirit and in truth!

ERNEST PHILLIPPS (author of "Papal Merchandise.")

## TWO GREAT PATRIOTIC RALLIES

### NEWARK, N. J.

A great religious and patriotic rally was held under the auspices of the Silent Workers of the World at the Washington Theatre, in Newark, N. J., on the afternoon of Sunday, December 14th. The theatre was packed with an assembly of about 2,500 people, although admission could be had only by ticket, and tickets were sold in advance at 25 cents and 35 cents each. No tickets were sold on Sunday and none could be bought at the door. And the committee reported that for want of room the sale of tickets had been refused to nearly as many applicants as were sold to those who filled the building to the topmost seat in the second gallery. This speaks well for Rome-ruled Newark.

The Rev. Dr. Collins, of THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC, was the chairman, and the two addresses announced were made by Bishop Manuel Ferrando, Director of Christ's Mission and Editor of THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC, and by Prof. W. J. Durant, formerly a Roman theological student. Bishop Ferrando's address was received with many an applause and will be published in THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC, for which reason no comment upon it is needed here. Prof. Collins spoke of the work of Christ's Mission and made an earnest plea in behalf of priests who long for freedom from the Roman yoke and who need the help of Christ's Mission in obtaining their liberty, and he recited numerous interesting incidents in connection with the work of Christ's Mission and of priests who had found refuge in evangelical Christianity. Fifteen hundred copies of THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC were distributed among the audience, and the secretary of the Silent Workers made a plea for an increased subscription list and stated that it was the purpose of his organization to endeavor to secure 2,500 new subscribers to the magazine at once. Prof. Collins promised that if 2,500 new subscribers were added to the list at the present price, \$1.50 a year, an effort would then be made to reduce the price to \$1 a year, and later to a lower price if the increased subscriptions should enable the management to do so. The secretary urged that it was the earnest desire of his organization to enable the publishers

of THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC to publish the magazine twice a month at the lowest possible price, in order to find for it the widest possible circulation.

In presenting the speakers, Dr. Collins told the story of Bishop Ferrando's life and work in the Roman Church, and of his conversion and noble missionary work in Porto Rico and at Christ's Mission. The bishop was received with tremendous applause and was frequently interrupted with applause in the course of his address. When he had finished, several minutes elapsed before Dr. Collins could bring the audience to quietness. The chairman then presented Mr. Long, Editor of the "American Citizen," and Mr. Phelps, publisher of "The Menace," who each spoke a few words and who were each received with enthusiastic applause.

Dr. Collins made a closing address, with many interruptions for applause, during which there were two dramatic moments. He displayed the American flag and asked whether it should ever float supreme above all flags as the emblem of our national liberty. Cries of "Yes! yes!" came from all parts of the house. He placed the Bible above the flag and asked, "And shall the word of God be sustained as our rule of faith and of life and our charter of liberty, and shall we support and defend it with our flag?" Again cries of "Yes!" came from all over the house. Then, for want of a papal flag, he used a sheet of paper as representing one, and, explaining its emblems as the emblems of the traitor and usurper who honors no national flag, but who claims the right to sit in every throne and to rule in every parliament and congress, he asked, "And shall we allow this flag to be placed above the Stars and Stripes and above the Bible?" There were loud cries of "No!" Then placing it level with the American flag, he asked, "And shall we float it beside our national emblem, as we have so often seen it floated in recent days?" Again there were loud cries of "No! no!" Finally he dropped it upon the floor and, standing upon it, he said, "Then we shall place it **there**, where the flags of all unpatriotic usurpers should be placed." Here the applause was tremendous, showing that the spirit of patriotism is not dead in Newark.

Closing his address, Dr. Collins spoke of the official recognition of the political so-called "Pan-American" Roman mass on the part of the President of the United States and other officers of State, and asked the assembly to adopt the following protest which he had hurriedly written while the other speakers were addressing the meeting, viz.:

"We, citizens of Newark, N. J., assembled in Foxe's Washington Theatre, December 14, 1913, 2,500 strong, earnestly protest that the attendance of the President of the United States and of his cabinet and of our highest national judiciary, and of other national officers, at a Roman political mass on the national Thanksgiving Day is dangerous to the stability and well-being of our nation, giving the appearance of governmental sanction to the doctrine of the union of State and Church, and **that** with the Church claiming political sovereignty; and that such action of our national officers is prejudicial to the religious liberty of our nation. We implore our Chief Executive, in the highest interests of the country, to discontinue this custom.

"W. RUSSELL COLLINS,

"331 West 57th Street.

Chairman."

There was no need of counting a vote on the adoption of this protest; the outburst of applause was unanimous and so vehement and prolonged that it required some time to restore order. Men were upon their feet all over the house shouting motions for its adoption and seconding them. Some asked, "How will the President get it?" "How will you get it past Tumulty?" Others proposed various ways of delivering it. Dr. Collins promised that it would be telegraphed to the President and published in the daily newspapers, if they dared to publish it, and that it would be given to "The Menace," "The American Citizen" and THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC and other anti-Roman papers for publication. It cannot be found in the daily press except two inches in one paper in a badly garbled form. But the same daily papers contain columns of Roman Catholic news. At the close of the meeting Dr. Collins telegraphed it to the President.

The meeting continued from 2 until nearly 6 o'clock, and the spirit of earnestness and enthusiasm displayed betokened

something very real in the determination of American free-men not to submit to Roman suppression of our liberties. It also indicated that the Silent Workers, if silent, are certainly effective. This is only one of many such meetings under their auspices. The meeting closed with the singing of "My country, 'tis of thee," and the benediction, given by Dr. Collins.

At this meeting it was announced that there would be a great Protestant parade in Newark on next Washington's Birthday.

#### **BROOKLYN, N. Y.**

Another grand rally was held in the Academy of Music, Brooklyn, under the auspices of the Silent Workers, on the afternoon of Sunday, December 7th. The day was one of incessant rain, and although the attendance was large it failed to meet expectation. The chairman was the Rev. Dr. Robert R. Greenwood, Presbyterian, of Brooklyn, who introduced as speakers the Rev. Mr. Moffet, Adventist, of Jersey City, who spoke ably on the prophecy of the Bible against the Roman Church; the Rev. Dr. George McNeely, Baptist, of Newark, who gave a masterly address on the prophecies of Daniel and John in relation to Romanism; the Rev. Dr. A. E. Barnett, of the Reformed Episcopal Church of Philadelphia, who delivered an eloquent and stirring address on the question, "Shall Rome Rule America?" and the Rev. Dr. Collins, of Christ's Mission, who spoke of the work of Christ's Mission for converted Roman Catholics and of the work of THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC magazine. All the speakers received much applause, which could not be prevented, notwithstanding the earnest religious character of the addresses. The newspapers report these meetings poorly and stigmatize them as "attacks" upon Rome, in a manner which leads the public to suppose that Rome is a poor, persecuted victim instead of a vicious institution trying to destroy American liberty.

PROTESTANT-AMERICAN.

---

"I certainly appreciate your magazine to the full, considering it the best reading matter I have. I have read every word from first to last."—Subscriber.

## **CHRIST'S MISSION AND "CONVERTS' OF MYSTERY"**

Some days ago Christ's Mission received a visitation of reporters. Some unknown person informed them about our work, and for several days they besieged our office. The result was that we received several columns of newspaper advertisement in the New York "Herald," "Times," "Tribune," "Sun," "World," "Telegram" and other papers. Some of these reports present a fair statement of our work, especially that in the "Times," though without any commendation of it. The "Times'" report is followed by an interview with Mgr. M. J. Lavelle, Vicar-General and rector of St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York, and his secretary, Thomas J. Dunne, looking for a contradiction of our statements. Secretary Dunne, however, merely said it would be impossible to verify our statements. That is true, so far as he is concerned. He cannot verify them, for we will supply him with no information to the injury of those who seek our help. But the friends of our work may have all the verification they desire. Others of the reports are inaccurate, and in one case injurious. The "Sun" quotes us as saying, "The priests come here for instruction, not for conversion. The object of the Mission is not to convert." This is not true, and the statement is absurd. It has given just alarm to some of our friends, and is made an occasion of advantage to certain enemies, who, to gratify selfish purposes, seize upon every unfair opportunity to injure the Lord's work in this Mission, claiming to be friends, yet trying to work destruction, who, in God's providence, will be revealed in due time. The work of Christ's Mission is to-day, as it has always been, to convert men and women, priests or laity, Romanist or of no religion, to a saving knowledge of the Lord Jesus Christ and of the glorious truth of the evangelical Gospel. Some priests, it is true, come to us already converted, and then our work is to instruct them and to help them find missionary work to do. Newspapers are seldom accurate, as we well know, and we ask our friends not to be guided by every report that comes to them. There are others beside the newspapers who are circulating false reports about us and our work, and who are seeking to destroy this noble work. In due time these reports will receive their satisfactory answer. For the present we let them rest while we

attend to more pressing work. We merely ask our friends to be patient for a time and not to allow a one-sided statement, full of error and untrue in almost every word, to influence their minds. We cannot neglect our work to reply to every inquiry that comes to us immediately. But every false report will be exposed in the Lord's time.

Following these newspaper reports editorials appeared in "The Catholic News," of New York, and "The Standard and Times" (R. C.), of Philadelphia, discrediting our work. I give you this editorial in full:

#### **"CONVERTS" OF MYSTERY.**

"Last Monday Christ's Mission, No. 331 West Fifty-seventh Street, an institution founded by the late ex-Priest James A. O'Connor for the 'conversion' of Catholics, especially priests, to Protestantism, figured conspicuously in the newspapers. One newspaper story, headed 'Six Former Priests to be Protestants,' was in part as follows:

"Six former members of the Roman Catholic priesthood, two of whom were also members of monastic orders, are being cared for now by Christ's Mission and Reformed Catholic, an independent evangelical mission for the conversion of Roman Catholic clergymen, at 331 West Fifty-seventh Street. The Mission is providing means for the necessary training required for entry of the six into the Protestant ministry and mission field.

"Only one of the priests is from a near-by parish. The officials of the Mission decline to disclose his name on the ground that publicity would annoy him and handicap his future work. He is said to have resigned recently a parish of 1,000 communicants near New York."

"It is worthy of note that the newspaper accounts are indefinite when it comes to looking up names of the 'converts.' Only two of them are mentioned by name. One of the converted monks is described as 'John Hadj, who was a member of the Maronite's monastery, at Mount Lebanon, Syria.' As there are numerous Maronite monasteries at Mount Lebanon it is plain that it is not an easy task to ascertain what manner of man this 'John Hadj' is and whether or not he ever was a Maronite or a monk. The other 'convert' whose name is given is described as having come from 'a monastery in Italy.'

"When an inquisitive reporter asked the Protestant minister who is the secretary of Christ's Mission for the names and records of the six 'convert priests' that amiable gentleman said: 'We make it a rule here not to announce the names or history of the work of the Catholic priests who come to us.' No doubt that rule is a result of past experience, for, as every one must know, it is rather humiliating to make a big noise over a batch of 'Romish priests' rescued from superstition and then to be told by persons who make an investigation that the so-called 'converts' never were priests; or, if they were, they were unfortunates who had to be disciplined, and whose leaving the Church was no loss to it. It is a significant fact that converts to Catholicity are men and women whose records are unassailable, whereas there is always a lot of mystery about the persons who are exhibited as having been 'rescued from Rome.'"

I am glad the editor thinks we are at least "amiable," if nothing better. He might have said much worse about us. Of

course, we are liars, though he does not use that impolite word.

We have so much to publish in this number that we cannot say, now, all we would like to say about the work. But it may interest the Roman editors to know that we have had more than six priests under our care. At this very moment we are giving financial support to eight honest men, converts from the Roman priesthood, some of them, others formerly monks, who are studying and seeking to enter the Protestant ministry. We believe this is the largest work Christ's Mission ever did at any one time. During eight months past ten former priests and monks have received our financial help and instruction. Some of these we are now helping to obtain education in evangelical Bible schools. We have never before done so large a work. And many others have visited us for advice. Some have wanted help whom we had to put on the waiting-list, or refuse, for want of sufficient means. Say what the Roman editors may, priests are leaving Rome in large numbers. The secretary, whose acquaintance is not large, has talked with at least thirty converted priests within a year, and the director has talked and corresponded with many more.

But this work requires money. We need more than ever was needed. And if we are to do a large work we must plead with our friends to send us large means. The money enriches none of the workers. Salaries are fixed and small and far below the value of the service, and employees are insufficient in number and are overworked. An able and entirely responsible and trustworthy Board of Trustees of men well known for truth and justice directs and governs the work. Their names are a sufficient guarantee that no injustice can be done and that no trust can go astray. No selfish interests can prevail in any part of the work. It is entirely a work of self-sacrifice on the part of the workers. It is worthy of your most faithful support, and of your full confidence.

On Sunday, December 14th, the attendants at Christ's Mission enjoyed the privilege of listening to an able sermon delivered by the Rev. W. D. Stevens, D.D., pastor of the First Reformed Episcopal Church of New York.

On Monday night, November 24th, the Rev. Thomas M. Chalmers made a most helpful address under the auspices of the Committee on Christian Fundamentals.

On the evening of Monday, December 29th, the Rev. Charles

C. Cook, chairman of the Committee on Christian Fundamentals, will present Mr. A. C. Gaebelein at Christ's Mission, who will speak on "The Acquired Glories of Christ and Our Participation in Them." Mr. Gaebelein needs no introduction, and it is expected that our chapel will be filled beyond its seating capacity.

W. R. C.

## BOOK TALK

### **A Priest in Love**

By A. Wakend. Published in London by the Protestant Alliance. Price 50 cents. A clerical romance. Paper covers, handsomely printed on fine paper; 255 pages. The author says: "The object of this book is to offer a strong argument against the claims of the Roman Catholic priesthood to a special grace from Heaven which enables them to withstand the charms of woman." Evangelical Christendom says: "In this story, founded on fact and narrated with tactful reticence, we have a picture of Roman Catholic clerical life. . . . Few who know the facts will deny that the book does not serve a useful purpose."

### **Life of a Carmelite Nun**

By Henry Fowler, published by the Protestant Alliance, London. Price 25 cents. Paper bound, well printed on fine paper, 76 pages; 24 illustrations, actual photographs of inner convent life and instruments of torture. A true story of convent life and the cruelties practised in convents.

### **Startling Facts Under the Convent Veil**

Published for Mrs. Anna Cruikshank by the Protestant Alliance, London. Price 50 cents, paper covers; 75 cents, cloth. 100 pages. Fine paper, good print. Illustrated. The author's life. An interesting book.

### **The Great Harlot on the Seven Hills**

By Albert Close. Published by the London Truth Society. Paper covers, illustrated, 52 pages. Price 15 cents. A valuable little book.

Books to be ordered from abroad require about two weeks for delivery.



**Is the Pope to Rule America?**

By the Rev. Augustus E. Barnett, D.D. Paper bound, 168 pages; well printed on fine paper. Price 25 cents; by post, 30 cents. This is an able book, consisting of a series of addresses delivered from the author's pulpit in the Reformed Episcopal Church of Our Redeemer, Philadelphia. It has already had a large sale and is now in its second edition. Dr. Barnett is widely known as an eloquent opponent of Romanism.

**CHRIST'S MISSION CONTRIBUTIONS**

The following contributions were received for the work of Christ's Mission from November 11, 1913, to and including December 19, 1913. Kindly inform us if any names are omitted that should be included in this list:

A. C. M., \$10; Mrs. A. C. P., \$10; Mrs. D. C. F., 45c.; J. C., \$10; S. C. G., \$5; Mrs. F. A. L., \$124.50; A. O. O., \$10; D. A., \$10; W. K. B., \$5; H. W., \$10; Mrs. E. J. D., \$5; M. A. F., \$5; R. J. H., \$2; E. A. W., \$3; Mrs. M. E. McK., \$3.50; Mrs. G. H. H., \$1.50; S. B. Y., \$2.20; C. T., \$10; Mrs. H. A. B., \$1; M. A. P., \$2; A. J. W., \$2; Miss A. G. McC., \$5; Mrs. E. A. B., \$3.50; J. B. S., 50c.; Mrs. E. D. C., \$2.45; J. M., \$1.50; C. J., \$10; H. G. P., 50c.; E. A. P., \$2; H. S., \$10; H. M. McC., 50c.; D. H. S., \$7; J. B. E., 65c.; J. W., 50c.; J. M., \$1.45; Mrs. E. T. P., \$8.50; J. P. W., \$2; J. R. B., \$1; W. H. McL., \$3.30; W. C., \$2.80; W. H., 50c.

**THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC**

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE

Specially designed for the instruction of Protestants regarding Romanism and the enlightenment and conversion of Roman Catholics to the Evangelical Faith.

BISHOP MANUEL FERRANDO, D.D., PUBLISHER.

331 West 57th St., New York.

Subscription per Year.....One Dollar and Fifty Cents.

To ministers and missionaries, One Dollar per year.

Ten copies to one address, One Dollar and Twenty-five Cents per year.

Single copies, Fifteen Cents each.

Sample copies in quantities of twenty or more will be sold to one person at ten cents each and mailed free to addresses sent to the publisher.

Make all checks, drafts and money orders payable to the Treasurer of Christ's Mission, Box 8, Great Neck, L. I., New York.

Address all correspondence to the Director of Christ's Mission, 331 W. 57th Street, New York.

The date on the address label, on the wrapper, indicates when the subscription expires. It is bill when the subscription price is past due, and a receipt after payment is made and the date is changed. Therefore no other acknowledgment will be made of the payment of subscriptions in renewal. Acknowledgment by letter is laborious, expensive and consumes much time and is unnecessary.

Entered at the Post Office, New York, as second-class matter.

